These are hilly tracts. These are very difficult terrains. On the border in the states or countries like Burma there are militant groups which are operating. In India there are militant groups operating. They are operating on either side of the border. There will always be some activity of this kind. We are conscious of it. We are taking action in co-operation with the State Governments.

But, to speak of sealing the border, as I said, it is a catchy phrase. You cannot seal a border. You can only be vigilant and see that people do not infiltrate and they are kept out.

SHRI DHARANIDHAR BASUMATARI: May I know from the Home Minister, Sir, what the internal relation is between the ULFA and the AASU? The AASU has come out of the AGP. Now they are agitating against the Government of AGP at the moment. It is clear, Sir, the police is charging the ULFA with killing the people. But it is not they. It is they who are encouraging them. So, I want to know from the Minister what the internal relationship is between the AGP and the AASU, and also ULFA?

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Sir, I am very sorry, this kind of political infiltration is not easy to be stopped, and Government cannot do anything.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: Sir, my question is this. Northern Burma has always been a very soft spot where insurgents can find hide-outs, and they are there all the time. At times we have carried out joint operations in that area in order to deal with those insurgents who easily go and find hide-outs there. Can an effort be made to persuade the Burmese Government to carry out similar operations once again?

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, some of these crossings into Mizoram are as a result of the Burmese Army action on their side of the border against these groups which are really opposed to the Burmese Government. We can, of course, consider the suggestion which the hon. Member has made.

Demand for Statehood for Delhi

*262. SHRI MUKHTIAR SINGH MALIK:†
SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY:

Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is a demand from the prominent citizens of Delhi for a fullfiedged Statehood for Delhi; and

(b) if so, what decision has been taken by Government thereon?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI): (a) and (b) Demand for Statehood for Delhi has been made off and on. It is not proposed to bring about any change for the present.

श्री मुख्तियार सिंह मलिक : आदरणीय सभापति जी, मुझे मिनिस्टर साहब ने जो जवाब दिया है उसे सुनकर बड़ी हैरानी होती है क्योंकि स्टेटहुड की डिमांड दिल्ली के लिए आज कोई नयी नहीं है, बड़ी पुरानी चली आ रही है, सालों से चली आ रही है। तीन हुकूमतें यहां पर राज कर चुकी हैं। जनसंघ का मेटरोपोलिटन कौंसिल पर अधिकार रहा, जनता पार्टी का अधिकार रहा, दो दफा कांग्रेस (आई) का अधिकार रहा। सब की तरफ से यह रेजोल्यूशन पास हो चुका है कि दिल्ली को स्टेटहुड का दर्जा दिया जाये। खैर मैं इन बातों पर ज्यादा नहीं जाना चाहता। जैसे गधे का मुंह बांध कर हरी पत्ती डाल दी जाती है खाने के लिए उसी तरह की आज यह स्टेटमेंट दे रहे हैं कि फार द प्रेजेंट

†The question actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Mukhtiar Singh Malik.

आखिर कब तक इंतजार करते रहेंगे ? मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि 1985 के अंदर जनवरी या मार्च के महीने में जगप्रवेश चन्द्र जी जो दिल्ली मेटरोपोलिटन कौंसिल में सी.ई.सी. हैं उनके साथ मैटरोपोलिटन कौंसिल के मैम्बर्स और दिल्ली के पार्लियामेंट के मैम्बर्स मिले । उस वक्त...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are arguing for statehood. You are not putting a question.

SHRI MUKHTIAR SINGH MALIK: I am not arguing. I am asking a question. उस वक्त प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने 1985 में सी.ई.सी. को यह कहा था कि एक नोट तैयार किया जाये इसके ऊपर । 1985 में मार्च के महीने में यह बात हुई थी । मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि उसका क्या हुआ ? वह नोट वेस्ट पेपर बास्केट में गया या उसके ऊपर कोई एक्शन लिया गया या नहीं ?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: Sir, I have already given a reply that for many years our people here have expressed their desire for Statehood, but during all the past years it has been considered that because of the peculiar administrative set-up in Delhi and because it is the national capital it cannot be a separate State. It has all along been the stand of the Government. But, Sir, more and more democratic participation of the citizens of Delhi in administration of MCD and NDMC is being extended. That is the position today.

श्री मुख्तियर सिंह मलिक : आदरणीय सभापति जी, जैसे अभी मिनिस्टर साहब ने जवाब दिया है यह कोई सैटिसफेक्टरी नहीं है । यह साफ कह देते कि हम इसको नहीं बनाने जा रहे हैं । यहां पर असेम्बली का दर्जा नहीं दे रहे । यहां पर यह इधर-उधर की बात कह देते हैं कि यह नेशनल केपिटल है और कभी कुछ कहते हैं तो why blow hot and cold in the same breath?

मैं मिनिस्टर साहब से कहना चाहूंगा कि आपने कभी दिल्ली की पापुलेशन का अंदाजा लगाया है ? आप गोवा को स्टटहुड देने जा रहे हैं । आपने मिजोरम को स्टेटहुड दे दिया, अरुणाचल प्रदेश को दे दिया । क्या कभी इनकी आबादी को ध्यान में रख दिल्ली की आबादी को ध्यान में रख कर इस बारे में सोचा है ? जो यहां की जनता की दिक्कतें होती हैं, मेटरोपोलिटन कौंसिल के मैम्बर्स उनको दूर करने के लिए मजबूर होते हैं, लाचार होते हैं । यानि कि जो पब्लिक के रिप्रेजेन्टेटिव्स हैं उनके जो व्यूज हैं उनको दरगुजर किया जाता है। इनकी कोई बात नहीं सुनी जाती। इसके अन्दर आपको क्या दिक्कत है ? छोटी पापुलेशन के राज्य को आपने स्टेटहुड का दर्जा दे दिया तो इसमें आपके सामने क्या दिक्कतें पेश आ रही हैं यह मैं जानना चाहता हूं ? क्या मुश्किलातें आपके सामने आ रही हैं दिल्ली को पूर्ण राज्य का दर्जा देने में यह आप जरा बता दें ?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: I know Malik Saheb for long years. He also has a proverbial patience.

The point is whether there should be a legislative assembly for the Union Territory of Delhi or whether there should be Statehood. So far as Statehood is concerned, we have made the position very clear. This difficulty is there because Delhi is the national capital. But we have never said as Union Territory there should not be a legislative assembly. We have never ruled it out. That question is different from Statehood.

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA: Would the hon. Minister kindly reply whether there are any political parties which are opposed to the Statehood for Delhi or whether there is a unanimous demand from all the political parties. You know, Sir, that there was an Assembly here and what was the experience of the Government with that Assembly. Why was it dissolved?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: Sir, even in the States Reorganisation Commission they also came to the conclusion that the national capital must remain under the effective control of the national government and they recommended that since the population of Delhi was largely urban its problems fall within the domain of the municipal government and that municipal autonomy for Delhi in the form of a corporation would appear the most appropriate method of meeting broader requirements of the national Government as well as local needs and wishes of the people. The Union Territories have their Assemblies. But, Sir, Statehood is different and Assemblies are different. As all hon. friends have expressed their desire and we will think of it. Taking the totality of the circumstances, that can be considered some time.

SHRI VISHWA BANDHU GUPTA: Sir, my first part of the question is not answered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has read the report of the States Reorganisation Commission and that partly meets the question.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Sir, I have listened to the hon. Minister's reply. He said that since Delhi is a national capital, it is not possible to grant Statehood. But, Sir, there are so many Union Territories in India and one by one they have been granted Statehood. For example, Mizoram, Arunachal Pradesh and Goa, Daman and Diu is being considered for grant of Statehood. May I know from the hon. Minister, what is the real criterion for grant of Statehood to the Union Territories? Why he is not granting Statehood to Delhi? Is it because of national capital or there are some other categories or Delhi falls outside this criterion?

Regarding Assembly, in Pondicherry there is an Assembly. But Assembly with full powers is like a separate State. Would you visualise that type of Assembly? If that is so, what is the difficulty in granting Statehood?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: Sir, we have the Union Territories Act, 1963 and in that Act itself there are provisions for Assemblies and the Union Territories have their Assemblies. There is a fixed criterion as to when a Union Territory should achieve the Statehood. So far as Delhi is concerned, there is a difference between an Assembly and Statehood. That is what I am trying to explain to our hon. friends. Because of the national capital, there are some problems for which we can consider the question of greater participation in the Assembly. But Statehood in the capital has been studied well for many years and it has been found out that because of its situation and Embassies working here, different communities are here, this kind of a thing was not considered best. But so far as Assembly is concerned, all hon. Members have expressed their desire and when we take into consideration the entire circumstances and whenever the situation arises, at that time a decision will be taken.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the answer says that the demand for Statehood has been made from time to time. The fact is that the promise of a Statehood has been made by all parties repeatedly. This is an electoral promise and commitment, and not merely a demand. I concede that Statehood is different from Legislative Assembly for a Union Territory. Why has the Government not taken even a single step in the direction of granting at least a Legislative Assembly to the Union Territory of Delhi? When decisions have been made for a much smaller population like that of Mizoram, Arunachal and now for Goa, I welcome all these, but I see no reasons why there should be any futher delay in granting as least a Legislative Assembdy for the Union Territory of Delhi.

In practical terms, the problems of Delhi arise mainly from the multiplicity of authorities here, DDA, NDMC, Delhi Municipal Corporation, Metropolitan Council and all these Bodies have their own sphere, empire, etc., and common citizen is at loss to understand, whom to approach. The only solution is a unified body—either a full-fledged State or at least a Legislative Assembly. What is Government's solution in this regard?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: We understand the anxiety of Shri Advani and other Members put forward before the House. Government and Home Ministry are seriously considering this aspect, the multiplicity of institutions like DDA, etc. It has been seriously considered as to how to overcome all these difficulties. I can seriously say, when the Members are expressing their desire for a Legislative Assembly for Delhi, the totality of all the circumstances would have to be taken into consideration. The desire of all honourable Members also would be taken into consideration. Whenever the opportune moment comes, we will consider all these aspects of a Legislative Assembly.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: The Minister said there is unanimity as far as political parties are concerned. He also showed anxiety that there should be an Assembly for Delhi. In view of this I would like to know from the Minister whether he can indicate a time-frame and say an Assembly will be created for the Union Territory of Delhi by such and such time.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: What I said was we have taken into consideration seriously the desires of the honourable Members expressed in the House. We have to find out the pros and cons of it, whether it is feasible to have a Legislative Assembly for Delhi or not. All the relevant factors have to be taken into consideration. The process has to be gone through. Prof. Lakshmanna, please wait for some time. The time cannot be set today or tomorrow.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : मान्यवर, मैं मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूं कि स्टेटहुड, पूर्ण राज्य का दर्जा और असेम्बली ये दो बातें आप अलग अलग बता रहे हैं जब कि मांग बराबर पूर्ण राज्य की रही है। कभी भी मांग सिर्फ असेम्बली की नहीं रही, एक बात। दूसरी बात यह है कि जो कठिनाइयां हैं उन कठिनाइयों का उल्लेख आप भी करते हैं और अभी माननीय आडवाणी जी ने भी किया कि जो भिन्न भिन्न विभाग इसमें हैं तो इन कठिनाइयों को दूर करने के लिए अभी तक कुछ किया गया है क्या? तीसरी बात, जो दिल्ली महानगर परिषद् है वह नगर निगम से भी कामकाज के मामले में बिल्कुल बेकार साबित हो चुकी है तो आप बार बार कह रहे हैं कि हम सीरियसली कंसीडर कर रहे हैं। तो आजादी के 40–41 वर्षों के बाद भी आपकी यह सीरियसनैस कब खत्म होने की आयेगी? कुछ तो लिमिटेशस बताइये ?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: I have answered just now. There is difficulty. Honourable Members have said there is multiplicity of administration in Delhi. That factor has been very often mentioned in this House and the Government has taken serious note of it. Secondly, ...

SHRI JAGDAMBI PRASAD YADAV: What is the meaning of serious notice? आज तक जब कुछ नहीं कर पाये तो सीरियस नोटिस का क्या अर्थ रहा ?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: Serious notice means seriously being considered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister is very seriously considering your very serious question. Mr. Minister, you are very seriously considering his very serious question.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : सभापति जी, दिल्ली के मामले को हंसकर न उड़ाया जाय। मंत्री जी का यह जवाब हास्यास्पद है और इसमें मंत्री जी एवं सरकार की भी स्थिति हास्यास्पद है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not ridiculous. He is very seriously considering it.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : सीरियसली बार बार कह रहे थे । कोई लिमिटेशन दिल्ली का है ही नहीं ?

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: The honourable Minister quoted from the report of the States Reorganisation Commission and expressed his desire to keep New Delhi as a federal city. Federal city is a common phenomenon for all federations. For example, in the United States Washington is a federal city. But in Washington you can see the federal colour. Every important avenue or street is named after every State of the United States of America. You can see Massausettes Avenue. Each avenue is named after a State whereas in Delhi you never see the federal colour. For example, Sir, you have unveiled the statue of Shri Kamraj and there is the statue of Valluvar and also the statue of Subramania Bharati is there. Other than these, Sir, there is nothing in the sense of being pan-Indian. But everything has the UP colour. Only UP colour is given to everything. Even some of the communications that we receive are in Hindi and we cannot even read them and we cannot even understand them. Therefore, Sir, may I request the honourable Minister to keep the federal colour, to keep the federal character? Also, Sir, Hindi alone should not be allowed to be the official language, but English also should be allowed to be the language of communication in the so many bodies that are there in Delhi, autonomous bodies that are there in Delhi, so that the federal colour, the federal character, will be retained in this federal City.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Sir, I would like to dispel immediately the picture, painted by the honourable Member, of Delhi which has been there for centuries. It is the real repository of all the national aspirations. We have the statues of Rajaji, Kamraj Ji, Subramania Bharati, and of people from all parts of the country... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: In some corner, in some remote corner. Shame, shame. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI BUTA SINGH: There are roads and there are avenues ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: How many roads and how many avenues?.... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI BUTA SINGH: There are roads and there are avenues named... (*Interruptions*) ... not only after our national leaders, Indian leaders, but also international leaders. We have the Tolstoy Marg and there is the Simon Bolivar Marg and there is the Mobutu Marg. (*Interruptions*). And, Sir, some of the Old Delhi areas are really the historical places representing not only India's, but also the world's most prominent writers, prominent leaders, eminent artists, etc. I think, Sir, if the honourable Member does not take it otherwise ... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: What about the Hindi chauvinism in Delhi? (*Interruptions*). What about the Hindi chauvinism which is there in Delhi? (*Interruptions*). We cannot understand anything. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Perhaps you do not understand the culture of Delhi. (*Interruptions*). Sir, the honourable Members, I will recommend, should take a bus and go to Purani Delhi .. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: There is no culture of Delhi ... (*Interruptions*). There is no Indian culture here. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Sir, Delhi is holding...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let not such interruptions be recorded. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI BUTA SINGH ... the richest of the Indian culture and also the international culture for centuries. I should say that I am really disappointed with the Members from Tamil Nadu because they do not seem to be enjoying Delhi and they do not like Delhi and perhaps that is the problem. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: I am not talking about the hospitality here. I am talking about the language problem. The problem is language and we cannot understand Hindi. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VIRENDRA VERMA: Please try to understand every language. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Buta Singh, I think you are inviting only trouble for yourself. I will now move on to the next question. Now, Question No. 263. Mr. Puglia. Not here.

*263. [*The questioner* (*Shri Naresh C. Puglia*) *was absent. For answer*, vide *col.* 30 infra].

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Question No. 264. Mr. K. K. Birla.

Illegal poaching of protected animals in Dudhwa Wildlife National Park

*264. SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR BIRLA: Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware of the threat to the tigers in Dudhwa Wildlife National Park which are being gradually exterminated by the poachers and also of the systematic destruction of the ecology of the National Park by illegal felling of trees;

(b) if so, what is the number of tigers and other protected animals in the Park killed by the poachers during the last three years, yearwise;

(c) what is the estimated area affected by the illegal felling of trees; and

(d) whether Government have made any investigation into the matter; if so, what is the outcome thereof and the steps contemplated to remedy the situation?

THE MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI BHAJAN LAL): (a) Reports alleging poaching of tigers and illict felling of trees in the Dudhwa National Park have been received. The State Government of Uttar Pradesh has reported that there is no poaching in the Park but that a part of the Park is affected by illegal felling of trees.

(b) No tiger or other protected animal has been killed by poachers in the park during the last three years. However, one tiger has died in January, 1987 due to poisoning.

(c) The State Government has reported that about 10 sq. kms. of the Dudhwa National Park is affected by the illegal felling of trees.

(d) Inquiry has been made with State Government which have replied as in (a) above. The State Government have been advised to take effective measures to control the illegal felling of trees in the Dudhwa National Park. The Central Government is providing financial assistance for the protection of the Dudhwa National Park.

श्री कृष्ण कुमार बिरला : मान्यवर, विश्वस्त सूत्रों के अनुसार आठ महीनों में 15 शेरों की हत्या कर दी गई है। मंत्री जी ने यह कहा कि एक भी शेर नहीं मारा गया है लेकिन अखबारों में छपी खबरों के अनुसार 15 शेर मारे गये तथा जंगल के अधिकारियों का यह कहना है कि कुछ शेरों ने आत्म-हत्या कर ली है जो आज तक कभी सुनी भी नहीं गई है **(व्यवधान)** इससे बढ़कर के और बहानेबाजी नहीं हो सकती है। लापरवाही जंगल के अधिकारियों की और दोष मढ़ देते हैं शेरों के ऊपर। दरअसल में वास्तविक चीज यह है कि शेरों की खाल, खोपड़ी और हड्डी इन के दाम बहुत ऊंचे होते हैं और उसमें बड़ा अवैध व्यापार चल रहा है। जब तक यह अवैध व्यापार खत्म नहीं होगा तब तक शेरों की हत्या बंद नहीं होगी। मैं मंत्री जी से यह प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूं कि वे इस अवैध व्यापार को रोकने के लिए क्या उपाय सोच रहे हैं ?